



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,558	10/09/2001	John C. Lynk	14426ROUS01U	7814

626 7590 02/11/2005
NORTEL NETWORKS LIMITED
P. O. BOX 3511, STATION C
OTTAWA, ON K1Y 4H7
CANADA

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2154

DATE MAILED: 02/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/973,558	LYNK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenny Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 and 24-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-22 and 24-28 are presented for examination. Claim 23 is not presented in the disclosure.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Patent application numbers listed as prior art references in page 16 of the specification needs to be updated. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 27 claims to be depending on a non-existing claim Claim 30. Appropriate correction is required. For the propose of examination, claim 27 is treated as a depend claim depending on claim 26.
4. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 15 should not depend on claim 16 that is presented later in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.
5. A series of singular dependent claims is permissible in which a dependent claim refers to a preceding claim which, in turn, refers to another preceding claim.

A claim which depends from a dependent claim should not be separated by any claim which does not also depend from said dependent claim. It should be kept in mind that a

Art Unit: 2154

dependent claim may refer to any preceding independent claim. In general, applicant's sequence will not be changed. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 8, 10-12, 14, 16-21, and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitchaikani et al (Pitchaikani), US 6,061,505, in view of Schenkel et al (Schenkel), US 5,933,416.

8. As per claims 1 and 17, Pitchaikani taught the invention substantially as claimed including a processing apparatus arranged to be coupled to a network of nodes linked together by physical connections (col.4, lines 15-24), the processing apparatus comprising:

- a. A receiver that operates to receive at least one logical connection parameter associated with each of at least one port within a plurality of the nodes (col.2, lines 25-27, 31-38, 40-50, col.4, lines 28-32, 43-48); and
- b. A processor, coupled to the receiver, that operates to process the received logical connection parameters (col.4, lines 57-65).

Art Unit: 2154

9. Pitchaikani did not specifically teach that the logical connection parameters are processed in order to predict at least one physical connection between two of the ports within the plurality of nodes based upon the results of the processing. Schenkel taught that various measures of similarity can be used to determine the communication path coupling (col.2, lines 7-9, col.3, lines 66-67, col.4, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Pitchaikani and Schenkel because Schenkel's teaching of processing to measure similarity in the parameters to determine communication path coupling enables Pitchanikani's system to determine a suitable physical connection between two similar ports (col.2, lines 7-14).

10. As per claim 18, Pitchaikani taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method of predicting at least one physical connection within a network of nodes linked together by physical connections (col.4, lines 15-24), the method comprising:

- a. Receiving at least one logical connection parameter associated with each of at least one port within a plurality of the nodes (col.2, lines 25-27, 31-38, 40-50, col.4, lines 28-32, 43-48);
- b. Processing the received logical connection parameters (col.4, lines 57-65).

11. Pitchaikani did not specifically teach to predict at least one physical connection between two of the ports within the plurality of nodes based upon the results of the processing. Schenkel taught that various measures of similarity can be used to determine the communication path coupling (col.2, lines 7-9, col.3, lines 66-67, col.4, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2154

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Pitchaikani and Schenkel because Schenkel's teaching of processing to measure similarity in the parameters to determine communication path coupling enables Pitchanikani's system to determine a suitable physical connection between two similar ports (col.2, lines 7-14).

12. As per claim 26, a network comprising:

- a. A plurality of nodes linked together by physical connections (col.4, lines 15-24);
- b. At least one processing apparatus arranged to be coupled to the nodes, the processing apparatus operating to received at least one logical connection parameter associated with each of at least one port within a plurality of the nodes (col.2, lines 25-27, 31-38, 40-50, col.4, lines 15-24, 28-32, 43-48; station 120); and process the received logical connection parameters (col.4, lines 57-65).

13. Pitchaikani did not specifically teach that the logical connection parameters are processed in order to predict at least one physical connection between two of the ports within the plurality of nodes based upon the results of the processing. Schenkel taught that various measures of similarity can be used to determine the communication path coupling (col.2, lines 7-9, col.3, lines 66-67, col.4, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Pitchaikani and Schenkel because Schenkel's teaching of processing to measure similarity in the parameters to determine communication path coupling enables Pitchanikani's system to determine a suitable physical connection between two similar ports (col.2, lines 7-14).

14. As per claims 2 and 19, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18. Schenkel further taught to process the received logical connection parameters, the processor operates to, for a first one of the two ports, determine at least one most probable port that the first port is physically connected to, this most probable port being the second of the two ports (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26).

15. As per claims 3 and 20, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18. Schenkel further taught to process the received logical connection parameters, the processor operates to, for a first one of the two ports, determine a set of most probable ports that the first port is physically connected to, this set of most probable ports including the second of the two ports (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18).

16. As per claims 4 and 21, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 3 and 20. Schenkel further taught to determine a set of most probable ports that the first port is physically connected to, the processor operates to determine a port similarity variable for a plurality of the ports when compared to the first port; and insert all ports that were determined to have the largest port similarity variable within the set of most probable ports (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18).

17. As per claim 5, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3. Schenkel further taught that the port similarity variable for each of the ports when

Art Unit: 2154

compared to the first port is equal to the number of logical connections that are identical between the first port and the particular port that the port similarity variable is being determined for (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18).

18. As per claim 8, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Pitchaikani further taught that if there are a plurality of logical connection parameters associated with each of the at least one ports, the processor selects one or more of the plurality of logical connection parameters to predict the at least one physical connection (col.4, lines 57-65).

19. As per claim 10, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Schenkel further taught to predict at least one physical connection between two of the ports within the plurality of nodes, the processor operates to predict physical connections between a plurality of pairs of the plurality of nodes based upon the results of the processing (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18).

20. As per claim 11, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Pitchaikani further taught that the at least one logical connection parameter associated with each of at least one port within a plurality of the nodes comprises logical channel information (col.2, lines 25-27, 31-38, 40-50).

21. As per claims 12 and 24, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18. Pitchaikani further taught that the at least one logical connection

Art Unit: 2154

parameter associated with each of at least one port within a plurality of the nodes comprises a user label (Table 1).

22. As per claims 14 and 25, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 18. Schenkel further taught the processor predicts at least one physical connection between two of the ports within the plurality of nodes based upon the results of the processing and based upon known physical connection information with respect to the network (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18).

23. As per claims 16 and 27, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 26. Pitchaikani further taught to receive at least one logical connection parameter associated with each of at least one port within a plurality of the nodes, the receiver operates to receive stored information from a database (col.5, lines 6-25).

24. Claims 6-7, 9, 13, 15, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pitchaikani and Schenkel as applied to claims 1-5, 8, 10-12, 14, 16-21 and 24-27 above, and further in view of "Official Notice".

25. As per claims 6, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Schenkel further taught to process the received logical connection parameters, for a first one of the two ports, determine a set of most probable ports that the first port is physically connected to, this set of most probable ports including the second of the two ports (col.2, lines 7-

Art Unit: 2154

9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18). Pitchaikani and Schenkel did not specifically taught to sort the ports within the plurality of nodes based upon the number of logical connections at the ports. However, it is obvious to sort ports to place the ports in specific order. Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantage of sorting is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pitchaikani and Schenkel and further sort the ports in a preferable order to enable easy search and reading of the information.

26. As per claim 7, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6. Schenkel further taught to determine a set of most probable ports that the first port is physically connected to, the processor operates to determine a port similarity variable for a plurality of the ports when compared to the first port; and insert all ports that were determined to have the largest port similarity variable within the set of most probable ports (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18). Pitchaikani and Schenkel did not specifically teach the processor to start operating with the port with the largest number of logical connections and proceeding until a subsequent port would have a number of logical connections less than the largest port similarity variable already determined. However, it is obvious to place the ports in a specific order for operation. Official Notice is taken that the limitations narrowed by these claims are consider obvious and furthermore a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pitchaikani and Schenkel and further placing the ports in a specific order of one's desire for operation in Pitchaikani and Schenkel's system.

27. As per claim 9, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 8. Pitchaikani and Schenkel did not specifically teach that the selecting is performed with a graphical user interface integral to said processor. However, Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantage of using a graphical user interface for controlling processors is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pitchaikani and Schenkel and further provide a GUI for the users of Pitchaikani and Schenkel to control and select the preferred parameters for operation.

28. As per claim 13, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 3. Pitchaikani and Schenkel did not specifically teach that if multiple ports are included within the set of most probable ports, a span address associated with each port is used to determine the port with which there is a physical connection. However, Pitchaikani taught to use identifiers to determine the ports (Table 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pitchaikani and Schenkel and also use span address as identifiers to determine the ports with physical connections from the physical connection information received (Pitchaikani, col.2, lines 39-50).

29. As per claim 15, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 15. Pitchaikani and Schenkel did not specifically teach that the known physically connection information comprises information generated within an auto discovery procedure.

Art Unit: 2154

However, it is obvious to include various types of information in the physical connection information. Official Notice is taken that the limitations narrowed by these claims are considered obvious and furthermore a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pitchaikani and Schenkel and further include all useful information in the physical connection information valuable to the users of Pitchaikani and Schenkel's system.

30. As per claim 22, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 18. the processing step comprises: for a first one of two ports, determining a port similarity variable for a plurality of the ports when compared to the first port; and inserting all ports that were determined to have the largest port similarity variable within a set of most probable ports that the first port is physically connected to, this set of most probable ports including the second of the two ports (col.2, lines 7-9, col.5, lines 1-26, col.9, lines 12-18).

Pitchaikani and Schenkel did not specifically teach to sort the ports within the plurality of nodes based upon the number of logical connections at the ports and start operating with the port with the largest number of logical connections and proceeding until a subsequent port would have a number of logical connections less than the largest port similarity variable already determined. However, it is obvious to sort ports to place the ports in specific order for operation. Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantage of sorting is well known and expected in the art. Official Notice is taken that the limitations narrowed by these claims are considered obvious and furthermore a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pitchaikani and Schenkel and

Art Unit: 2154

further placing the ports in a specific order of one's desire using sorting methods for operation in Pitchaikani and Schenkel's system.

31. As per claim 28, Pitchaikani and Schenkel taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 26. Pitchaikani and Schenkel did not specifically teach that the network is an optical network. However, Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Pitchaikani and Schenkel to all compatible networks. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Pitchaikani and Schenkel and further implement such teachings to all compatible networks including optical network.

Conclusion

32. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Tani, US 6,195,331.

Breitbart et al, US 6,697,338.

Dowling et al, US 6,574,239.

Kondo, US 5,841,981.

33. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.


Art Unit: 2154

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl
January 28, 2005



John Follansbee